

To: Frithsen, Jeff[Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov]
Cc: Hough, Palmer[Hough.Palmer@epa.gov]
From: Schofield, Kate
Sent: Thur 3/5/2015 11:13:52 PM
Subject: RE: Bristol Bay OIG Follow-up Questions re: Carol Woody
OIG 20150304 Question Concerning Woody Reports Draft v1 ks.docx

Attached are my comments on the OIG request. In comments I added some further specifics about where/how the references were cited – just let me know if you need any additional info.

(b)(6) Personal Privacy

Kate Schofield | 703-347-8533 | schofield.kate@epa.gov

Mailing Address: USEPA (8623-P), 1200 PA Ave. NW, Washington DC 20460
FedEx and Ground Deliveries: Two Potomac Yard (North Building), 2733 S. Crystal Drive, Arlington VA 22202

From: Frithsen, Jeff
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 3:57 PM
To: Hough, Palmer; Parkin, Richard; Suter, Glenn; Schofield, Kate
Subject: FW: Bristol Bay OIG Follow-up Questions re: Carol Woody

My response to the questions below is attached. Please review and let me know if you have comments by COB March 9. Thanks.

Jeff

Jeff Frithsen

USEPA-ORD-NCEA

From: Holthaus, Randy
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2015 4:19 PM
To: Frithsen, Jeff
Cc: Hough, Palmer; Parkin, Richard; Gilbride, Patrick; Stolz, Luke
Subject: Bristol Bay OIG Follow-up Questions re: Carol Woody

Jeff,

Back on January 13, 2015 you provided responses to us regarding some questions we had about Ann Maest's work and how EPA dealt with her work in the BBWA. I have a few similar questions about Carol Woody and her work and how EPA used it and the reason(s) for doing so. Please respond to the questions below via email to me **no later than COB March 10, 2015.**

1. Did you ever become aware of or identify any concerns with potential partiality of Ms. Woody on the Bristol Bay/Pebble mine issue? If so, please describe the concerns you became aware of or identified, and how EPA addressed them.

2. We have heard concerns that the peer review panel's overall opinion/assessment of the two Woody studies that EPA used in the BBWA was not positive. For one of her studies (*Fish Surveys in Headwater Streams of the Nushagak and Kvichak River Drainages*), we understand some on the peer review panel said the study had no discussion of an impact assessment methodology or any documentation of an environmental assessment. We also understand that some reviewers thought the conclusions in the report were not strongly supported by the evidence presented. Do you believe these statements to be accurate? Why or why not?

3. For the other study (*Groundwater as Essential Salmon Habitat in Nushagak and Kvichak River Headwaters: Issues Relative to Mining*), we understand that peer reviewers said that a very limited field study of one day was used, and words like "significant" that have specific scientific or regulatory meaning were lacking supporting citations. Is that correct? If so, why was this study used?

4. Generally, how did EPA use Woody's reports in the BBWA? Specifically, did EPA use the data from her reports in the BBWA (please describe)? Did EPA use Woody's conclusions to support EPA's BBWA (please describe)?

5. What differences are there between the Maest issues and the Woody issues such that you decided not to use the Maest information in the BBWA but you did use the Woody reports?

Thanks,
Randy

Randy P. Holthaus

Project Manager

EPA Office of Inspector General

Office of Program Evaluation

Science, Research, and Management Integrity

Dallas, TX

phone: 214-665-6620